

Date February 6, 2007
Response to Office Action dated August 9, 2006
Our Reference: ENL-346-A

7

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-8, 10 and 12-15 remain in the case.

Claims 1, 6, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 1385247.

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 13-15 were allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all limitation of allowable claim 2 and the original base claim 1. Therefore claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claim 4 has been amended to now be dependent upon allowable claim 1. Claims 6-8 have been amended to include all of the limitations of base claim 1 and the respective claims 6, 7 or 8. Claims 6-8 are now believed to be allowable. Claim 10 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable claim 11 and original base claim 10. Claim 10 is now believed to allowable.

This amendment should place this case in condition for passing to issue. Such action is requested. If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present application can be expedited by way of an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE &
HELMHOLDT, P.C.



Darlene P. Condra
Attorney for Applicant (s)
Registration No. 37113
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107
Date: February 6, 2007
DPC/caw